

more mockery, they moved that the committee should be instructed to inquire into the truth of each specific charge in Mr. Kremer's letter, and should be authorized to send for persons and papers. The friends of Mr. Clay showed that they were opposed to a thorough investigation, by refusing to adopt his proposition. They simply referred the matter to a partisan committee, without authority and without instructions, and at full liberty to pursue such course as should seem to them most likely to promote the interests of Mr. Clay.

Mr. Kremer, of course, refused to appear before this one-sided committee. The committee so reported, and the house let the matter drop.

THE CONSUMMATION.

The election came on, on the 9th of February, twelve days after Mr. Kremer's letter was published in the *Columbian Observer*; and precisely as that letter had predicted, Mr. Clay and his friends gave their votes to Mr. Adams. To use again, the eloquent language of another, he broke the triple cord of honor, principle and duty. He abandoned his principles, deceived Ohio, betrayed Kentucky and sold the west to her ancient enemy. He voted for one whom he had denounced as one of the basest of his race; a dangerous politician and a vindictive man. He voted for one of the cabinet, whom it was avowed to be the first object of his friends to defeat. He voted for one whom he had taught Kentucky to hate, and against one whom she had called upon him, almost by acclamation to support.

In the election by the House, Mr. Adams, in addition to the votes of the seven States which had originally supported him, received the votes of Maryland, Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri and Louisiana. The votes of the last five of these States were in the hands of Mr. Clay, because they were represented in the House by his personal friends. Illinois had but one representative; Missouri but one; and of the Louisiana delegation, but two out of the three were friendly to Clay. Thus it happened that FOUR MEN, following the dictation of Henry Clay, disposed of the votes of THREE STATES, which in the election by the House balanced the votes of the great States of Pennsylvania, Virginia and North Carolina, each of which voted against Mr. Adams. Truly did Mr. Kremer announce, "that men, professing democracy, could be found base enough to be the axe at the very root of the tree of liberty."

As soon as Mr. Adams was inaugurated, he appointed Mr. Clay his Secretary of State, and thus was completed every requisition of the foul bargain with which he stood charged.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE ON CLAY'S NOMINATION.

The appointment of Mr. Clay, was not confirmed by the Senate without a strenuous opposition on the part of those Senators who best understood the means by which that appointment had been obtained. The following is an extract from a speech made upon that occasion by Gov. Branch, of North Carolina.—See *Niles' Register*, vol. 33, p. 22.

"Has it come to this, that nothing but proof positive of corruption will justify the Senate in appointing a man? If so, we are more degenerate than I had imagined. What are the facts of this case, as generally admitted to be true, to which we are not at liberty to turn a deaf ear? We see two political opponents, neither having confidence in the other, at a critical moment, when the leaves and fishes are about to be divided, the one, in opposition to the well ascertained wishes of the people of his State, fly into each other's arms, and cordially embrace, without aught appearing to the world of reconciliation and adjustment of former differences. By which means and by which alone the one is enabled to grasp the presidential chair, in violation of the sovereignty of the people with a salary of \$25,000 per year, and the Senate of the United States is called upon to aid this President, thus made, to confer on the other the State department, with a salary of \$60,000, and thereby making him heir apparent to the presidency."

The vote upon the confirmation stood, 27 for it, to 14 against it. This was an opposition at that time entirely unprecedented in the case of a cabinet appointment. Many democrats voted for the confirmation because they were desirous to avoid the least appearance of a factional opposition to the new administration; but among those who felt constrained to vote against it, were the venerable Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina; Col. Hayne, of South Carolina; Gen. Jackson of Tennessee; Gov. Tazewell, of Virginia, and Gov. Branch, of North Carolina.

CLAY'S EARLIEST EXCUSE.

The excuse which Mr. Clay first laid before the public for his bold and shameful coalition with Mr. Adams appeared in the form of a letter to one of his friends in Virginia. This letter was written twelve days before the election, but was not published until after the election. By a singular coincidence, it is dated on the very day on which the publication of Mr. Kremer's letter first announced the coalition to the world. It has every appearance of having been written just after the bargain was concluded, and while Mr. Clay was yet agitated by those fears likely to beset a man about to enter upon a dark career of treachery and shame. We give the letter entire, as found in the 27th volume of *Niles' Register*, at the 29th page:

"WASHINGTON, 28TH JAN. 1825.

"My dear Sir:—
"My position in regard to the presidential contest, is highly critical, and such as to leave me no path on which I can move without censure. I have pursued in regard to it, the rule which I always observe in the discharge of my public duty. I have interrogated my conscience as to what I ought to do, and that faithful guide tells me that I ought to vote for Mr. Adams. I shall fulfil its injunctions. Mr. Crawford's state of health, and the circumstances under which he presents himself to the house appear to me to be conclusive against him. As a friend of liberty and the permanence of our institutions, I cannot consent, in this early stage of their existence, by contributing to the election of a military chieftain to give the strongest guaranty that this republic will march in the fatal road which has conducted every other republic to ruin. I owe to our friendship this frank exposition of my intentions. I am and shall continue to be, assailed by all the abuse which partisan zeal, malignity and rivalry can invent. I shall view, without emotion, these effusions of malice, and remain unshaken in my purpose. What is a public man worth, if he will not expose himself, on fit occasions for the good of his country?
"As to the result of the election, I can not speak with absolute certainty; but there is every reason to believe that we shall avoid the dangerous precedent to which I allude.
"Be pleased to give my respects to Mr. —, and believe me always your cordial friend."
"H. CLAY."

"The Honorable F. Brook."—
Yes, it is here shown that Mr. Clay already felt the premonitory admonitions of conscious guilt. He anticipates the indignation of an insulted people, and he calls the assaults which he so naturally expected the "effusions of malice." He adds that he "shall view" these effusions "without emo-

tion;" yet, as we have seen, only three days after writing this letter, on the 31st of the month, he sent a card to the National Intelligencer, laden with the "emotions" of a bully and a duelist! CLAY'S HORROR OF A MILITARY CHIEFTAIN.

The sole reason which he assigns to Judge Brook for his contemplated vote is, that Jackson was a "military chieftain," and that it would be "the strongest guaranty" of the ruin of this republic, to elect a military chieftain in this early stage of its existence. What miserable hypocrisy, and oh! what wretched folly was this? Had Mr. Clay in his moment of madness, forgotten the immortal name of Washington? Did he imagine that the American people had ceased to remember that it was a brave and successful military chieftain who had been their first president? Did he vainly hope that he could make any free born citizen believe that it was a stain upon a man's character, and a disqualification for office, that he had perilled his life in the defence of his country, and had led his countrymen to victory and to glory?

CLAY'S ALLUSION TO HIS CONSCIENCE.
Mr. Clay pretends to Judge Brook, that he had "interrogated his conscience," as to what he "ought to do," and that THAT told him he "ought to vote for Mr. Adams." Did it also tell him, that he ought to set the will of the people at defiance, abandon his republican associations, give the lie to all his past professions, shake hands with his bitter enemy, and betray the west to an apostate eastern federalist, who had offered to barter its dearest interests to the British? This tale about his conscience was too monstrous for belief, even at THAT day; and certainly, it will not do, at this day, to talk of the conscience of that man who penned the challenge that brought the lamented Cilley to an untimely grave.

CLAY'S PRETENDED PATRIOTISM.
Affecting a spirit of self-sacrifice, of which he has never given a single example, Mr. Clay asks, "What is a public man worth, if he will not expose himself on fit occasions, for the good of his country?" When we ask, has Mr. Clay ever exposed himself for the good of his country? Had he, like Andrew Jackson, bared his breast in the deadly battle-field? Had he ventured his fortune? Had he submitted to the least degree of privation and hardship? No! his life had been whiled away amid the luxuries of office. He had ever reclined upon the silken couch of political power; and the very act which he was then endeavoring to excuse, was but a selfish attempt to trim his sails so as to catch the breeze which might waft him onward to the goal of his ambition.

CLAY'S ADDRESS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS.

The awakening wrath of an offended people, beginning to press heavily upon him, Mr. Clay saw fit on the 26th of March, 1825, to issue, in his own defense an "address to his constituents." The address occupies 16 printed columns of *Niles' Register*. In all the words of this elaborate document, strange as it may appear, he gives but two reasons for his vote against Jackson: 1st, that Jackson, as a mere military chieftain, was not "so competent to discharge the various, intricate and complex duties of the office of chief magistrate as his competitor; and 2d, that, by voting for Adams he would conform to the wishes of the Ohio delegation." The first reason was given in the letter to Brook; the last, though it was all he had been able to add to his defense in the space of two months, is too palpably false to have the weight of a feather in Mr. Clay's favor, for, as we have before shown, Mr. Clay's friends in Ohio, in the address of their State convention, in July, 1824, had solemnly declared that the election of Mr. Adams was the "event which it was the first object of the friends of Mr. Clay to PREVENT." Any man who knows J. Sloane, J. C. Wright, J. Vance, and Mordecai Bartley, the men who were then the leaders of "the Ohio delegation," knows that Clay never conformed to their wishes, but that they conformed to the wishes of Clay. If the whigs of this day can believe that Henry Clay followed the lead of John Sloane, upon the most important question he was ever called upon to decide, and that, too, in violation of the instructions, almost unanimously given by the legislature of Kentucky, it is plain that they must believe Sloane the greater man of the two, and we would humbly advise them in that case, to drop Clay and take up Sloane as the candidate under whom they will meet defeat in the ensuing election.

THE OBJECT OF THE COALITION.

Even if there were not one particle of positive testimony upon the subject, it would still remain as clear as the noon day sun, that Mr. Clay made Adams President for the sake of obtaining the office of Secretary of State and securing the succession to the Presidency. THE CASE PROVES ITSELF. "Am I asked for the proof?" said Mr. McDuffie in the House of Representatives, "I answer that if circumstantial evidence be not rejected as inadmissible, it is full and satisfactory. Hear it! He gives the vote of his State in opposition to his own principles—against the will of the people of that State—and thereby makes the President; and then has the FRONTLESS, SHAMELESS AUDACITY, to set public opinion at defiance, by instantly and openly receiving, as the reward of his treachery to the people, and to his own principles, the highest office that President can confer upon him! Can any thing be more plain? It is the common case, of a sale in market overt; and none but a man of the most consummate boldness and effrontery could hold up his head in society after such a transaction!"

There is abundant evidence, however, of the most positive character, to show why the vote of Kentucky was given to Adams.

Gen. Metcalf, one of the members from Kentucky, when he returned to his constituency after the election, stated as an excuse for voting for Adams, "We could not possibly get Mr. Clay into the cabinet without voting for and electing Mr. Adams."

Francis Johnson, another Kentucky member, said, after his return from Washington, "that he voted for Mr. Adams to get Mr. Clay made Secretary of State."

David Trimble, another Kentucky member, apologized for his vote by saying, "We ascertained that Mr. Adams would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State, and that Jackson would not."

David White, another of the delegation, declared, "I voted for Mr. Adams to promote Mr. Clay's future prospects for the presidency."

John J. Crittenden, the same who is now in the Senate of the United States, was then, as now, probably the most intimate of Mr. Clay's friends. The following is an extract from a letter, from Mr. Crittenden to David White at Washington, dated,

"FRANKFORT, JAN. 18, 1825.
"Extract. "Under all present circumstances, my first wish in regard to this subject (and it is one dictated both by personal partialities and considerations of the public good) would be that JACKSON should be President, and Clay his Secretary of State, and I really do believe that the common good is more concerned in Clay's being Secretary of State, than it is in the question whether Jackson or Adams should be President."

We append another extract, from the same letter, to show the political morals of that time, as well as the slavish devotion to the interests of Mr. Clay, which was then inculcated upon the Kentucky members.

"I voted for him, [Calhoun.] it is true, as Vice President, but I did it because I thought he was the ablest man. If I had thought Clay's interest would have been advanced a hair's breadth by voting against Calhoun it would have been done."

This letter was published in the Kentucky papers in 1828, and its authenticity has never been denied. When it was written, Crittenden had not yet learned that Jackson had refused to bargain for the Presidency, and he therefore expressed his honest preference for Jackson as President.

THE LINE OF "SAFE PRECEDENTS."

But Mr. Clay has indiscreetly given us evidence upon this subject from his own pen.

In his letter to Judge Brook, he says, "There is every reason to believe that we shall avoid the dangerous precedent to which I allude." That "precedent" was the election of Andrew Jackson.

In his address to his constituents, of March 26, 1825, he says,

"In his [Andrew Jackson's] elevation to this office, I thought I perceived a fearful precedent; and I am mistaken in all the warnings of instructive history if I erred in my judgment."

But how did he regard the elevation of Mr. Adams? In the same address last quoted he says, "I saw in his election, the establishment of no dangerous example. I saw in it on the contrary, only conformity to the safe precedents which had been established in the instances of Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, who had respectively filled the same office from which he was to be translated."

Connect with this declaration, the fact that Clay became Adams' Secretary of State, and what does it mean? Simply this: that as Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe were successively elevated from the office of Secretary of State to that of President; and as John Quincy Adams was about to be, by his vote, so he himself could likewise be elevated to the same office, after the expiration of Adams' term. This it was, that made the election of Adams "a safe precedent," and that of Jackson a "dangerous" and a "fearful" one. Mr. Adams would appoint Mr. Clay his Secretary of State. General Jackson would not. If Jackson would have agreed to appoint Clay his Secretary, as Crittenden desired, his election, without doubt, "in the twinkling of an eye," would have been converted into one of the most beautiful and acceptable of "precedents."

CLAY'S SELF-CONTRADICTION.

In his address to his constituents, of March 26th, 1825, Mr. Clay asserted that before he had left Kentucky in the preceding fall, he had stated to two individuals, the one a Dr. Drake, and the other John J. Crittenden, his "determination to support Mr. Adams, in preference to General Jackson." On the 12th of July, 1827, nearly two years and a half after the election, in a speech made at a public dinner, at Lexington, Kentucky, Mr. Clay declared—

"It has been established, and can be further proved, that, before I left this State the preceding fall, I committed to several gentlemen, of the highest respectability, my fixed determination not to vote for General Jackson."—[See Mallory's edition of Clay's Speeches, vol. 1, p. 540.]

In an address to the public, dated December, 1827, Mr. Clay reiterates this assertion, and dwells upon it at great length. He also makes a witness of John J. Crittenden, and gets him to testify, in a letter, dated September 3d, 1827, that he, [Clay], previous to going to Washington in the fall of 1824, had said to him that it was impossible for him to vote for Jackson "IN ANY EVENT." It happens, however, that this is the same John J. Crittenden who wrote to David White, on the 19th of January, 1825, that he desired that "JACKSON SHOULD BE PRESIDENT AND CLAY HIS SECRETARY OF STATE," and this, too, in a letter which manifested the most devoted subservience to Mr. Clay.

But, unfortunately for Mr. Clay, he has himself furnished ample contradiction of the truth of these statements. His own address of March 26th, 1825, abounds with declarations for the purpose of showing that he made up his mind as to his vote for Adams, after he arrived at Washington. We will give a few extracts from that address, as we find them in Mallory's edition.

"Up to near Christmas," says Mr. Clay, "it remained uncertain whether Mr. Crawford or myself would be returned to the House of Representatives." That matter having been determined against Mr. Clay, he adds—

"I found myself transformed from a candidate before the people, into an elector for the people. I deliberately examined the duties incident to this new attitude, and weighed all the facts before me, upon which my judgment was to be formed, or reviewed."

Mr. Clay here speaks of examining the duties incident to a "new attitude," and of a judgment which "was to be formed." Will any candid man pretend that such language agrees with the story that he had previously determined his vote? Again he says:

"The first inquiry which it behooved me to make was, as to the influence which ought to be exerted on my judgment, by the relative state of the electoral votes which the three returned candidates brought into the House from the colleges."

Here, the first inquiry in the process of forming his judgment, is stated to have been in relation to a fact which was entirely unknown to him until the last of December. After disposing of this subject, he says:

"I proceeded to examine the other considerations which belonged to the question."

After the statement of the chief of these "other considerations," we find the following words:

"A collateral consideration of much weight, was derived from the wishes of the Ohio delegation.—A majority of it, during the progress of the session made up their opinions to support Mr. Adams, and they were communicated to me."

Is not this a plain declaration that his decision was strongly influenced by opinions of others, communicated to him "during the progress of the session"? Yet Mr. Clay would be glad to have it believed that his mind had been made up long before the commencement of the session, while he was yet in Kentucky. Surely no indicted criminal was ever found to have involved himself in a more palpable contradiction.

Mr. Clay's letter to Judge Brook, which we have before given, may also be referred to in this connection. That letter bears date the 29th of January, only twelve days before the election, and was evidently written by a man who had but recently decided on his course.

Further testimony upon this subject is given by Governor Floyd, of Virginia; a man whose veracity Mr. Clay never dared to dispute. Gov. Floyd testified that, in the month of January, 1825, or in the latter part of the preceding month of December, he called upon Mr. Clay to ascertain his determination as to the Presidential election, and that Mr. Clay then stated his position to him "in nearly the following words":

"When I take up the pretensions of Mr. Adams, and weigh them, and lay them down—then take up the pretensions of General Jackson, weigh them, and lay them down by the side of those of Mr. Adams—I never was as much puzzled in all my life, as I am to decide between them."

It is in view of facts like these, that we are fully justified in adopting the strong declaration of Mr. McDuffie—that the circumstances of the extraordinary coalition between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, furnish as strong evidence of an ABANDONMENT OF POLITICAL PRINCIPLE on the part of Mr. Clay, and a CORRUPT POLITICAL BARGAIN between him and Mr. Adams, as is ordinarily required in courts of justice, to establish the guilt of those who are charged with the highest crime known to the law.

Tell us not that Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay have, with solemn appeals to Heaven, asserted their own innocence. The facts are too decisive—and their own declarations, however solemn, can have no more weight than the self-exculpatory declarations of who stands arraigned for his crimes, at the bar of a court of justice.

THE DUEL WITH JOHN RANDOLPH.

Finding that he was not able to stem the tide of public opinion, neither by his pen nor by his tongue, Mr. Clay resorted to the weapons of which he had first thought when, on the 31st of January, 1825, he saw Mr. Kremer's letter to the *Columbian Observer*. That which he had failed to accomplish as a writer and an orator, he hoped to accomplish in his character as a duelist. Accordingly, in April, 1836, he singled out one of the boldest of his opponents, John Randolph, of Virginia, and challenged him to mortal combat. The provocation and ground of the challenge, were the words we have placed at the head of this address, which Mr. Randolph had made use of on the floor of the Senate, in describing the union between Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams. Upon their meeting, at the second fire, Mr. Randolph, not choosing to kill Mr. Clay, fired in the air, and the parties separated. Whether it was "a safe precedent" for an American Secretary of State to challenge and fight a member of Congress for words spoken in debate, is a question we leave our readers to determine. Mr. Clay's "conscience," which he always "interrogated" upon important occasions, undoubtedly told him, that aside from the risk which he run of getting shot, the precedent was perfectly "safe."

HOW THE ISSUE WAS TRIED.

The matter in issue between Mr. Clay and his accusers, was tried, not by a partisan committee as he had once endeavored to have it, but by the unbought people of the country. From the time of the consummation of the bargain up to the election of 1828, it was the main question before the people. The bargainers were backed by all the patronage of the government, and they struggled as if for their very lives. Coffin handbills, monumental inscriptions, "shuffled militia documents," and every species of slander, falsehood and foul abuse, were the aliment which the coalition administration dealt out to the people. Every thing was resorted to, which could corrupt, intimidate, or seduce. Mr. Clay himself became a travelling electioneer, a haranguer at political barbecues and dinners, and used all the eloquence and all the ingenuity he possessed, to persuade the people that he was innocent. He even ventured, in a public speech made at Baltimore, in May, 1828, to invoke the name of Dely in his behalf, and pray that the Almighty would send "WAR, PESTILENCE AND FAMINE" upon the country, rather than the election of that man whom, four years before, he had defrauded of the office to which the place he held in the hearts of his countrymen had justly entitled him. The following were Mr. Clay's words, as reported in *Niles' Register*, vol. 34, page 183:

"I would humbly prostrate myself before Him, and implore his mercy, to visit our favored land with war, with pestilence, with famine, with any scourge, other than military rule, or a blind and heedless enthusiasm for mere military renown."

THE RESULT.

But all the efforts of the coalition were in vain. The majority which the people gave to the brave and noble-hearted Chief of the Hermitage, was overwhelming. Every one of the five States, whose Representatives had followed the lead of Mr. Clay, voted against Clay and Adams. Even Kentucky herself refused to ratify the corrupt bargain of her false Representative, and voted for Andrew Jackson. Adams obtained but 83 out of 261 electoral votes, and the whole nation hailed the elevation of Jackson as "a precedent" which vindicated the sovereignty of the unbought million, and rescued the government from the hands of those who had made base traffic of honor, principle and duty, and whose corrupt ambition had threatened the total ruin of our free institutions. The verdict of the country, in 1828, was repeated, with still more emphasis, in 1832. Clay, himself, was then the sole candidate of his party, and, out of 286 electoral votes, he received barely 49.

SHALL THE VERDICT BE REVERSED?

It is nearly twenty years since the commission of the high offence for which Mr. Clay was thus condemned; and he now has the effrontery to seek a reversal of that verdict which was pronounced upon his case while the fact was still recent, and all its circumstances were fresh within the memory of the people. If it is reversed at all, it must be done, not on the ground of newly discovered testimony and established innocence, but on the same principle upon which a condemned felon receives a pardon from the Executive. And what has Mr. Clay done to entitle him to his country's clemency? Has he repented of the high crime of which he was guilty? Has he, in the least degree, atoned for the foulest insult which was ever offered to the majesty of a free people? Has he blotted out his former infamy by a subsequent life of generous devotion to the interests of his country? No; his offence is unrepented, it is not, and it never can be blotted out. He has continued, up to this day, to exhibit the same selfish spirit and unprincipled ambition which, in 1825, led him to violate the most sacred obligations of his life. His political schemes have been framed solely for his own political aggrandizement. His measures have all been disastrous to the country, and the very agitation of his plans has been constantly the source of mischief and confusion. And we ask you, fellow-citizens, that it may not be forgotten that, from the time of the coalition to the present moment, he has never ceased to be the virulent opponent and

vindictive villain of ANDREW JACKSON.— True it is, his malignant labors have ever been in vain, and JACKSON has all the while, continued to increase the estimation of his countrymen:—yet Clay's bad passions have seemed only to burn with greater fury; his malice has been none the less, and he, therefore, none the less deserves the censure and rebuke of the millions who love and venerate the most illustrious statesman and hero of our times.

The people of Ohio have a double interest in this question, because, they have not only to pass again upon the claims of HENRY CLAY, who especially deceived them in 1824, and whom they condemned, both in 1828 and in 1832, but they have also before them, as the anti-democratic candidate for Governor, MORDECAI BARTLEY, of Richland, one of those men, of the "Ohio delegation," who became the willing instruments, in the hands of Mr. Clay, for the consummation of his corrupt and treacherous bargain. Let, then, the voice of Ohio be heard on the side of sound principles and of political honor, and that, too, in such thunder tones as demagogues may never hear but once.

We leave the subject, fellow-citizens, to your candid consideration, with a confident assurance that you will honestly discharge your whole duty; and we rejoice in the anticipation, that the result of the pending Presidential election will not only be auspicious to the best interests of our beloved country, but that it will also make the name and fate of HENRY CLAY, a solemn warning, and "a fearful precedent" to every corrupt and faithless politician, through all time to come.

CHARLES B. FLOOD,
THOMAS J. MORGAN,
JACOB MEDARY,
S. D. PRESTON,
CHARLES A. LOOMIS,
Young men's democratic State Central Committee,
Columbus, O., May 6th, 1844.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

From the Saturday Evening Post.
ARRIVAL OF THE ACADIA—SIXTEEN DAYS LATER—O'CONNELL SENTENCED!

The steamer Acadia arrived at Boston on Wednesday, bringing dates sixteen days later.

Trinity Term opened on the 22d May, and on Friday the 24th, the case of the Queen against Daniel O'Connell and others having been called, Mr. Justice Perrin proceeded to deliver his judgment.

Mr. O'Connell, accompanied by Mr. Smith O'Brien, M. P. and by Mr. Steele entered the traversers' bar at half past ten. All the barristers of the outer bar, with the exception of comparatively few, rose and greeted Mr. O'Connell with loud and repeated rounds of cheers, accompanied with clapping of hands. This demonstration of acclamation continued for a few minutes.

At four o'clock, amid breathless anxiety, Mr. Justice Burton, in an address during which he shed tears, passed SENTENCE UPON THE TRAVERSERS. Daniel O'Connell.—I do be imprisoned for twelve calendar months; to pay a fine of £2,000, and to enter into securities to keep the peace for seven years; himself in £5,000, and two sureties of £2,500 each.

John O'Connell, J. Gray, T. Steele, R. Barrett, C. G. Duffy, and F. M. Ruy, to be imprisoned for nine calendar months; to pay a fine of £500, and to enter into securities to keep the peace for seven years; themselves respectively in £1,000, and two sureties of 500 lbs. each.

Sentence having been passed, Mr. O'Connell immediately rose, and said that he wished to remind the Court, that he had made a solemn affidavit, declaring that he had not entered into conspiracy with the other traversers, or committed the crime with which he was charged. He had now only to say it was his painful conviction that justice had not been done.

A sudden and vociferous cheer from nearly all parts of the court followed this result; and although it was accompanied by the clapping of hands among the junior bar, and was two or three times repeated, the judges did not interfere although evidently displeased.

The traversers immediately surrendered themselves into the custody of the Sheriff.

After waiting about a couple of hours the prisoners were conveyed to the Richmond Penitentiary, in three carriages. A large crowd, who greeted Mr. O'Connell with cheers, met him at the Penitentiary, and a large body of respectable persons, many his most intimate friends stood in the court yard, in two lines and received him in silence and uncovered.

Mr. O'Connell and his fellow, occupy the Governor's house, which is large and airy, and has a garden attached, in which the prisoners were seen walking, soon after their committal. Not the slightest breach of the peace occurred.

Mr. O'Connell issued an address, in which he pledges himself to bring an appeal before the House of Lords, and urges the people to be quiet. The address which is somewhat long, contains nothing but reiterations of what O'Connell now calls his "command" to be quiet.

From the New York Herald of June 18.
TWO DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.
Texas agitation in England—state of the Cotton Market, &c. &c.

One of our famous packets, the well known Independence, Captain Nye, stole the march upon the steamship Acadia, and arrived here yesterday afternoon with two days later news from Europe. She sailed from Liverpool at 1 o'clock on the 21st ult.

The agitation and excitement on the Texas question continue to increase in England. The London Times and

other journals are full of denunciations of the United States, characterizing the annexation as public robbery, and predicting that it will eventually unsettle the peace of Europe.

There has been a little French fighting in Algeria. Portugal, Spain, Greece, France, &c. were quiet.

O'Connell's motion for a new trial was to have been settled for or against, on the 23d ult. Judgment against a new trial was anticipated.

TEXAS.—Although the fate of the treaty for the annexation of Texas depends on the decision of two thirds of the Senate of the United States, that treaty, whether it be ratified or not involves many novel and important considerations which chain the serious attention of all governments and of the public. We, therefore, revert to this very fertile subject with an especial view to the effects of the treaty on Texas herself, and on her position as an independent community in relation to other States; for although the ratification of the treaty by the U. States is highly improbable at the present time, we assume that the commissioners who acted on behalf of Texas were duly qualified and empowered to make the declaration with which the treaty opens: "The republic of Texas, acting in conformity with the wishes of the people and every department of its government, cedes to the United States all its territories, to be held by them in full property and sovereignty &c., and to be annexed to the United States as one of their territories," &c. Whatever, therefore the issue of this negotiation may be, unless the treaty be disavowed by the Senate of Texas, as well as by the Senate of the United States, we have this most extraordinary and unprecedented declaration on the part of the people lately aspiring to a place in the family of nations—that in conformity with the wishes of the community and of every department of government, they surrender their territory, and consequently their existence, to be the property and dominion of another nation. This is an occurrence, as we believe, entirely new in modern political history; and we are driven in our search for a precedent to turn to the pages in which Livy has recorded the voluntary surrender of the Campanians to the absolute authority of the Roman Senate.

The course of events and the probable frustration of Mr. Tyler's notable project will doubtless bring this difficulty to a pacific solution; but, with a view to the future existence of Texas, it is of importance to remember that the first use she attempted to make of her boasted independence was a total abdication of all political power; and that in her anxiety to obliterate herself from the political chart of America, she violated every engagement she had been allowed to contract with the powers of Europe. The reason of these anomalies is sufficiently obvious. Texas and the Texans have no real existence distinct from that of the people of the United States; they are Americans in disguise; and although they assume a false nationality and a false flag to facilitate an enterprise which was too disgraceful or too dangerous for the cabinet of Washington to avow, yet they are already eager to divest themselves of their temporary character, and to bring the spoil of their unparalleled invasion into the native market.

It will be remarked, that while this treaty of annexation is silent on all the important political points to which we have adverted, it deals with great precision and liberality with the pecuniary part of the arrangement. The debts & liabilities of Texas, the amount of 10,000,000 dollars, are to be assumed by the federal government; and thus by way of exception to the general experience in such matters, if this treaty were ratified, the holders of Texian bonds would suddenly find their property converted into the best security which the continent of America affords. Such an operation in Texian finance cannot have escaped the discernment of the persons concerned in the negotiation, and we must take leave to conjecture that it may have contributed in no slight degree to the concoction of the whole scheme. It is difficult to treat with gravity or patience the offspring of such base and petty passions as are here disclosed on either side; but however mean may be the motives of this treaty, however probable its rejection, the question which it has raised for the first time are intimately connected with the stability of the American union, the commercial policy of the United States, and the peace of the world.—*London Times*.

COFFEE.—The great increase of the production of coffee, and a diminution of its consumption in many countries, have materially decreased the value of the article itself. But few know the vast quantity of coffee now produced. The statistics for 1843 give the following result:

	Pounds.
Brazil (1,170,000 bags)	170,000,000
Java and Sumatra (1,450,000 bags)	140,000,000
Cuba	45,000,000
St. Domingo	35,000,000
Porto Rico, Laguaira, &c.	25,000,000
British West Indies	10,000,000
Ceylon	7,000,000
East Indies and Mocha	6,000,000
French Colonies	4,000,000
Dutch West Indies	3,000,000
Total	453,000,000